

SK



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

AW

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/387,805 09/01/99 EDWARDS T EDWARD-37219

PM82/1204
SCOTT W KELLEY ESQ
KELLY BAUERSFELD LOWRY & KELLEY LLP
6320 CANOGA AVENUE SUITE 1650
WOODLAND HILLS CA 91367

EXAMINER

NELSON, J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3644

DATE MAILED: 12/04/00

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/387,805

Applicant(s)

EDWARDS ET AL.

Examiner

Judith A. Nelson

Art Unit

3644

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 September 1999.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. & 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

If applicant desires priority under 35 U.S.C. 119 (e) based upon a previously filed copending application, specific reference to the earlier filed application must be made in the instant application. This should appear as the first sentence of the specification following the title, preferably as a separate paragraph. The status of nonprovisional parent application(s) (whether patented or abandoned) should also be included. If a parent application has become a patent, the expression "now Patent No. _____" should follow the filing date of the parent application. If a parent application has become abandoned, the expression "now abandoned" should follow the filing date of the parent application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent 6,035,809 (Fingerett et al).

Fingerett et al disclose a leash assembly (as shown in fig. 1), comprising a housing (38) with a defined handle (44) and an interior compartment (inferably

interpreted by the Examiner to house the extending retractable leash (40)); a leash (40) extendable from and retractable into the interior compartment (note col. 3, lines 1-3); a tubular pet refuse bag dispenser (10), underlying (see col. 2, lines 28-38; and fig. 1) the handle (44) the bag dispenser (10) including a lid ¹(28) which permits access to an inner cavity of the bag dispenser (col. 2, lines 18-23); and a plurality of bags (note col. 1, lines 57-62) disposed within the bag dispenser.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-28 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3 of U.S. Patent No. 6,076,717 in view of U.S. Patent 6,035,809, issued to Fingerett et al.

Regarding claims 1-28, Applicants' U.S. Patent 6,035,809 discloses a pet dispenser bag, however the reference fails to claim a leash extendable from and retractable into an interior compartment. Fingerett et al teach the combination of a

leash extendable from and retractable into an interior compartment used with a pet refuse bag dispenser. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have combined a retractable leash with a pet refuse bag dispenser, as taught by U.S. Patent 6,076,717, since the Examiner takes Official Notice of the equivalence of the pet refuse bag dispenser in U.S. Patent 6,076,717 and that which is disclosed by Fingerett et al, for their use in the art of Animal Husbandry as means of dispensing pet refuse bags, and the selection of any of these known equivalents to dispense pet refuse bags would have well been within the level of ordinary skill in the art.

Conclusion


The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. U.S. Patents 6,085,695; 6,073,590; 6,019,067 and 5,727,500 which each disclose the combination of a pouch with non-retracted leashes.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Judith A. Nelson whose telephone number is (703) 305-0984. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Thur. 7:00 a.m. - 4:30 p.m., alt. Fri..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles T. Jordan can be reached on 306-4159. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-7687 for regular communications and (703) 305-7687 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 3644

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 306-4180.


Charles T. Jordan
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group 1

Judith A. Nelson
Examiner
Art Unit 3644

jan 
November 28, 2000

¹ Note the *Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary 10th Edition*, definition of the word lid\lid\l-n--- a movable cover for the opening of a hollow container".